

NOTES MODERN BIBLE VERSIONS

Origen was a heretic and Gnostic and along with Clement of Alexandria helped to corrupt the manuscripts giving us the false versions of today. Here are some of Adamantius Origen's beliefs. When he taught, he wore the pagan robes of the pagan philosopher plus he castrated himself based on his Gnostic views of the evil of the flesh.

- 1) He believed the Holy Spirit was a feminine force.
- 2) He believed in Soul Sleep
- 3) He was a very strong proponent of Baptismal regeneration
- 4) He believed that Jesus was only a created being and Gnosticism taught that Jesus became Christ at his baptism but that he was never God. He was a just a good man with very high morals.
- 5) He believed in the doctrine of Purgatory
- 6) He believed in transubstantiation
- 7) He believed in the transmigration of the soul and reincarnation of the soul.
- 8) He doubted the temptations of Jesus in Scripture and claimed they could have never happened.
- 9) The Scriptures were not literal. He was the father of allegory.
- 10) Genesis 1-3 was a myth, not historical or literal, as there was no actual person named "Adam."
- 11) Based upon Matthew 19, a true man of God should be castrated, which he did to himself.
- 12) He taught eternal life was not a gift, instead one must grab hold of it and retain it.
- 13) Christ enters no man until they mentally grasp the understanding of the consummation of the ages. (It was Frederick Dennison Maurice in the 19th century who defined eternal life as coming to a knowledge of God. This is the essence of Gnosticism.)
- 14) He taught there would be no physical resurrection of the believers.

Constantine's first edict in 331 AD. was to have fifty Bibles made up so he called on a man named Eusebius. Eusebius was mightily influenced by the teachings of Origen which resulted in him believing the same way, which means he was not a Christian. Eusebius had a good opportunity to use the pure manuscripts from Antioch but instead he chose the corrupted texts from Alexandria and thus the foundation for the modern bibles were formed. He used the fifth column in Origen's Hexapla. It is strongly believed in both camps that the foundational texts for the modern bibles, the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts, were two of the original fifty bibles that Eusebius made up. However, there is no specific evidence for this since both the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus differ from each other in over 3,000 places in the Gospels alone, which in my mind, would tell me that they could not have been

made by the same scribes from the same manuscripts at the same time. If they were copied from the same manuscripts, there would not be that much divergence.

The Vaticanus Manuscript (B)

The word "Vatican" in Latin means "Hill of Divination." (Deu 18:10 KJV) There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, The Vaticanus manuscript was found in the Vatican library in 1481. It was rejected by the King James Translators because it was very corrupt and unreliable. The following portions of Scripture are missing from the Vaticanus: Genesis 1:1-46; 28; Psalms 106-138; Matthew 16:2-3; Mark 16:9-20; The Pastoral Epistles (1 & 2 Timothy and Titus) and everything after Hebrews 9:14. These were intentional omissions because the manuscript was found in excellent condition with no pieces missing. In the Gospels it leaves out 237 words, 452 clauses, and 748 whole sentences. These omissions were intentional since there was room left on pages to write these in. The Vaticanus manuscript was written on expensive Vellum and was in good condition when found which means that the missing areas were not due to missing sections but intentional omission.

The Sinaiticus Manuscript (א) Aleph

The major characteristic of this manuscript is that it is a literary mess. There are mistakes, erasures, sentences written on top of other sentences plus many words are omitted. It contains nearly all the New Testament, the Apocryphal Books plus two other false books, "The Shepherd of Hermes" and "The Epistle of Barnabas." Every page contains corrections and revisions by at least ten different people. Corrections on the manuscript were made as late as the sixth or seventh century A.D. With so many revisions and corrections done to this manuscript, it made it totally worthless. It was found in a garbage can in St. Catherine's Monastery in 1844 by Constantine Tischendorf. The manuscript was so bad, the monks were going to burn the manuscript just for heat. It too omits Mark 16:9-20.

Constantine's first edict in 331 AD. was to have fifty Bibles made up so he called on a man named Eusebius. Eusebius was mightily influenced by the teachings of Origen which resulted in him believing the same way, which means he was not a Christian. Eusebius had a good opportunity to use the pure manuscripts from Antioch but instead he chose the corrupted texts from Alexandria and thus the foundation for the modern bibles were formed. He used the fifth column in Origen's

Hexapla. It is strongly believed in both camps that the foundational texts for the modern bibles, the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts, were two of the original fifty bibles that Eusebius made up. However, there is no specific evidence for this since both the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus differ from each other in over 3,000 places in the Gospels alone, which in my mind, would tell me that they could not have been made by the same scribes from the same manuscripts at the same time. If they were copied from the same manuscripts, there would not be that much divergence.

Here is what NIV translator Ralph Earle wrote about the two Alexandrian manuscripts:

Soon after the middle of the nineteenth century (1859), N. Tischendorf discovered in the monastery of Saint Catherine on Mount Sinai a fourth-century uncial manuscript of the entire New Testament, together with much of the Old Testament in Greek translation. From its place of discovery, it is called Codex **Sinaiticus**. ("Codex" means a bound book, in distinction from a scroll.) Soon after that he pressured authorities into making another fourth century manuscript available to scholars. It is called the Codex **Vaticanus**, because it is held in the Vatican library at Rome. Codex Sinaiticus is now in the British Museum.

These two **great** fourth-century uncials agree rather closely with the third century papyri [see below]. This provides us with a more accurate Greek text of the New Testament than that found in the Textus Receptus, which is based primarily on late minuscules. We should be grateful to God for making these early manuscripts available to us as the **basis** for an up-to-date, contemporary translation of an ancient text.

(From The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation, Edited by Kenneth Barker, pp 56,57, online ed.

<http://www.gospelcom.net/ibs/niv/mct/> Emphasis Added.)

The "third century papyri" referred to are "two copies of John's Gospel (Papyri 66 and 75) from about A.D. 200" (p 56). (So you see that since these four older manuscripts disagree with the the Majority Text (the TR), and agree with each other, the scholars concluded that they are "more accurate")

Notice that last sentence: "We should be grateful to God for making these early manuscripts available to us as the **BASIS** for an up-to-date, contemporary translation of an ancient text." Since Papyri 66 & 75

only contain the Gospel of John, they can not be used to translate any other book than John. Here you have it: NIV translator Ralph Earle admits that they used [Sinaiticus and Vaticanus](#) as the basis for their NT translation (excluding the Gospel of John)!!!

Note the gushing words he uses for these manuscripts: "these two GREAT fourth-century uncials" and "We should be thankful to God for making these manuscripts available to us..."

Question #36

QUESTION: Do the Dead Sea Scrolls render the King James Bible obsolete?

ANSWER: No, they support it.

EXPLANATION: The Dead Sea Scrolls which were found by an Arab shepherd boy in 1947 in the Qumran caves near Jericho, Israel have no ill effect on the Bible.

Their text **actually** agrees with the King James Bible. This fact makes them unattractive to scholars desiring to overthrow the perfect Bible. So, other than commenting on the irony of the way in which they were found, they are largely ignored.

The translators of the King James Bible did not need the Dead Sea Scrolls since they already had the Textus Receptus which they match.

Question #11

QUESTION: I've heard that the italicized words in the King James Bible should be removed because they were added by the translators. Should they be removed?

ANSWER: If we remove **any** of the italicized words we must either remove them ALL or accept them ALL as Scripture.

EXPLANATION: Following are the problems with removing the italicized words from the Bible:

1. Anyone who has ever translated from one language to another knows that words **MUST** be added to the finished work to complete the sentence structure of the new language.

All translators do this when translating the Bible. The King James translators were men of integrity so they put the added words in italics.

Example #1

Psalm 23:1 reads "The LORD *is* my shepherd" in the King James Bible. The word "is" was added by the translators to complete the sense of the sentence.

Psalm 23:1 in the New International Version reads, "The LORD **is** my Shepherd."

So it is plain to see that **both** sets of translators added the same word to complete the sentence. Yet the King James translators put the word in italics to inform the reader that they had added it.

Example #2:

John 1:8 reads, "He was not that Light, but was *sent* to bear witness of that Light" in the King James Bible.

John 1:8 reads, "He was not that light, but **was sent** to bear witness of that Light" in the New King James Version.

Again **both** sets of translators have added words to their translation so that it would make sense. In this case it is the phrase "was sent." Yet again, it is the King James translators who put their addition in italics for clarity.

Thus we see that the translators of our Bible should be commended on their integrity and ethics for their addition of the italicized words instead of castigated for a practice which **all** of our modern "would be" scholars follow routinely.

2. Critics of the Bible, fundamental or otherwise, claim that the italics can be removed, but NEVER remove them all. Usually they are stumped by a passage such as the word "unknown" in I Corinthians 14. Since they cannot explain the passage **with** the italicized word **in** the passage they make the thoughtless statement reproduced above and remove the problem word.

But this opens a tremendously large "can of worms"! For if we say that italicized words do not belong in the text, we cannot say that **one** italicized word should be removed from the Bible, but we must say that **ALL** italicized words must be removed from the Bible. Even the casual student of Scripture knows that the Bible will make no sense at all if **ALL** italicized words are removed.

To remove **one** italicized word and leave another in is to claim **Divine Inspiration** in knowing which words should go and which words should stay.

Regardless of how great a preacher, soul-winner, or scholar might be none of us are going to bow our knees to them with the claim that they are **Divinely inspired** to reject or accept words in the Bible. If we are so foolish as to exalt a man's opinion in such a way, who should we exalt? There are hundreds of Bible critics who would vie for the office of "Official Divinely Inspired Bible Corrector". Who would be

the lucky person? How would we choose him? And **WHO** would be so naive as to think that all Christians would follow his decrees? Yet **without** his decrees we have **NO WAY OF KNOWING** which italicized words belong in the Bible and which ones do not.

So we see that overcoming problem passages will require prayer and Bible reading instead of carelessly removing a troublesome word.

3. One of the classic defenses for leaving the italicized words alone is found in II Samuel 21:19.

"And there was again a battle in Gob with the Philistines, where Elhanan the son of Jaaroregim, a Bethlehemite, slew the brother of Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam."

By omitting the italicized words we have the Bible saying that **Elhanan** killed Goliath. Of course everyone knows that I Samuel 17 says that David killed Goliath. So we finally have the Bible that all lost men love to refer to when they say, "The Bible has contradictions in it".

Of course, our "Divinely Inspired Bible Corrector" would probably say the italics in II Samuel 21:19 do not need to be removed. But then who's to know **which** words to remove or which ones to keep in unless God "appeared" to them and told them.

4. Our fourth and best reason for not meddling with God's choice of words for His Bible comes from none other than the Apostles Peter and Paul and the Lord Jesus Christ Himself.

First, take a Bible (King James, of course) and read Psalm 16:8. I have set the LORD always before me: because *he is* at my right hand, I shall not be moved.

You will notice that the two words "he is" are in italics. Yet when we find the Apostle Peter quoting this verse in the New Testament in Acts 2:25 we find it says:

"For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved."

So here we find the Apostle Peter quoting Psalm 16:8 **italicized words and all!** You would almost believe that God wanted them in there wouldn't you?

Now it might be pointed out that Peter was an unlearned and ignorant man (Acts 4:13) and so, lacking the "benefits" of a Bible college education, he blindly accepted the Bible (King James?) as every word of God. But let us look at the same phenomena concerning the Apostle Paul and the Lord Jesus Christ.

Paul, as did other New Testament writers, often quoted from the Old Testament in his writings. In doing so, he quoted as did the others directly from the Hebrew Text. We have several of Paul's quotes which contain words not found in the Hebrew original.

In Romans 10:20 Paul quotes Isaiah 65:1.

Romans 10:20: "But Esaias is very bold, and saith, I was found of

them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me."

Isaiah 65:1 "I am sought of them that asked not for me; I am found of *them that* sought me not: I said, Behold me, behold me, unto a nation that was not called by my name."

Yet we see that the words "them that" which Paul quoted as though they were **in** Isaiah 65:1 exist only in the italics of the King James Bible.

The same is true of I Corinthians 3:20, "And again, The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain." which is a quote of Psalm 94:11, "The LORD knoweth the thoughts of man, that they *are* vanity." where we find the word "are" supplied by the translators.

But the most unexplainable is Paul's quote of Deuteronomy 25:4 in I Corinthians 9:9. For it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen?

Deut 25:4: "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out *the corn*."

Here we find Paul quoting the words "the corn" just as if they had been in the Hebrew original even though they are only found in the italics of our Authorized Version!

If one were to argue that Paul was quoting a supposed Greek Septuagint translation of the original Hebrew, our dilemma only worsens. For now, two perplexing questions present themselves to us. First, if such a Greek translation ever existed, (which is not documented in history) by what authority did the translators insert these words? Secondly, if they were added by the translators, does Paul's quoting of them confirm them as inspired?

While you ponder these important questions, we will note that **Jesus** also quoted from what appears to have been a King James Bible.

We find Him quoting a word that wasn't in the "originals". In fact, a word that only exists in the italics found in the pages of the King James Bible.

Read below, please, Deuteronomy 8:3.

"And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every *word* that proceedeth out of the mouth of the LORD doth man live."

You will note that the word "word" is in italics, meaning of course, that it was not in the Hebrew text. Upon examination of Deuteronomy 8:3 in Hebrew one will find that the word "dabar" which is Hebrew for "word" is not found anywhere in the verse.

Yet in His contest with Satan we find Jesus quoting Deuteronomy 9:3 as follows in Matthew 4:4.

"But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

While quoting Deuteronomy 8:3 Jesus quotes the entire verse **including the King James italicized word!** Even an amateur "scholar" can locate "ramati", a form of "rama", which is Greek for "word", in any Greek New Testament.

So, just as critics of the Bible like to joke and say, "Well, the King James was good enough for the Apostle Paul so it's good enough for me." A true Bible-believer can truly say, "Well, the King James was good enough for the Apostles Peter and Paul and for the Lord Jesus Christ, so it's good enough for me".

So we see we have three options on what to do with the italicized words in the Bible.

(1) Remove **All** of them.

(2) Exalt one of our fundamental Bible critics to the office of "Official Divinely Inspired Bible Corrector" and then give his decrees all the weight and allegiance that we would give to Jesus Christ.

(3) Leave **all** the words in our divinely inspired Bible alone, and trust that just **maybe** Jesus Christ is correct.

It's as though we **had** a choice.

QUESTION: I've heard that there have been many manuscripts discovered since 1611 that the King James translators didn't have access to. Do these strengthen or weaken the King James Bible?

ANSWER: They strengthen the King James Bible.

EXPLANATION: There have been many manuscripts found since 1611, but there have been no new **READINGS** found.

Many critics of the Word of God have used the argument of "new evidence" that the King James translators didn't have as a basis to degrade its authority. The fact is, that the King James translators had all of the **readings** available to them that modern critics have available to them today.

One of the most prominent manuscripts which has been discovered since 1611 is the Sinaitic manuscript. This witness, though horribly flawed, was found amongst trash paper in St. Catherine's monastery at the foot of Mt. Sinai in 1841 by Constantine Tischendorf.

Sinaiticus is a sister manuscript of the corrupt manuscript, Vaticanus. Both read very similarly. So, although the Sinaitic manuscript was discovered over 200 years after the Authorized Version was translated, its **READINGS** were well known to the translators through the Vatican manuscript which was discovered in 1481 and also through the Jesuit Bible, an English translation of 1582.

So we see that there are no readings available today to scholars which were not already in the hands of the King James translators. We might further add that an **honest** scholar will admit that this "great

number of newly discovered manuscripts" that are trumped abroad, agree with the Greek text of the Authorized Version rather than challenging it.